For review article

Triple negative breast cancer subclassified by immunohistochemistry: correlation with clinical and pathological outcomes in patients receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy.

Response to Reviewer

2 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files.

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Yes	*[Please give your response if necessary. Or you can also give your corresponding response in the point-by-point response letter. The same as below]*
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	Yes	
Is the research design appropriate?	Yes	
Are the methods adequately described?	Yes	
Are the results clearly presented?	Must be improved	
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	Yes	

Comment 1. Line 81- you state that demographics are in Table 4, but Table 4 is you antibody table and there does not appear to be a table in the manuscript that summarizes the demographics.

Response1: We apologise for this typo and amended to Table 2.

Comment 2. Table 2- This table is not clear. It is unclear and I assumed that (Mean (SD) and (N (%) indicated the numbers in the last two columns? Why are some of the % numbers in parentheses indicate that they are negative? I think it would be helpful to have column headings and to have all of the Mean (SD) all at the top so move the Ki67 to the top, then put in a new set of column headings to indicate N(%) for the rest of the table. Also why are you indicating the abbreviations for Basal-like (BL), immunosuppressed (IS), and immunoactivated (IA) in the middle of the table when these abbreviations are not even used anywhere else in the table? In the legend it needs to be indicated for AC, TXT, and wPac that the x4 and x12 means "number of cycles" like you mention in Table 3.

Response 2. We agree with the reviewer and made the alterations suggested in the mentioned table.

Comment 3. Line 88- What 4 markers did you stain for and why? This needs to be discussed.

Response 3. We agree and included in the results section the following phrase on line 84-86 "After balancing pros and cons from the antibodies used by studies present on Table 1, we chose the following four for our analysis: IDO-1 – Indoleamine 2,3-dioxygenase (IDO-1), Forkhead Box C1 (FOX-C1), claudin-3[19] and androgen receptor."

Comment 4. I originally thought you were not going to discuss Figure 1C & D until I read it after reading the data for Figure 2 in lines 141-145. I would suggest moving Lines 141-145 to line 123 so it stays with the rest of Figure 1.

Response 4. We appreciate this comment and made the alterations as suggested.

Comment 5. Figure 1 needs a legend

Response 5. We appreciate this comment and made the alterations as suggested.

Comment 6. Figure 1- indicate whether your time is in months or weeks on the x-axis.

Response 4. We appreciate this comment and included this in the legend

Comment 7. Line 130- Is this the incorrect table that goes with this graph?

Response 7. We re-checked and it seems correct.

Comment 8. Line 133- You state that the pattern of recurrence is graphically distinct but you should also indicate that the data is also not significant though based on the p value for the Log rank test.

Response 8. We appreciate this comment and included this information on line 132.

Comment 9. Figure 2- I would recommend putting the LAR into C & D even though it is zero, just so the data is still there and you don't have to depend on reading about this in the text.

Response 9. We appreciate this comment and amended the Figure 2.

Comment 10. Table 5- there is no legend, M or I abbreviations are not explained, Weak (W) could be moved to the legend so W can just be used in the Table.

Response 10. We appreciate this comment and included a legend on this table.

Comment 11. Supplementary figure 1 is not discussed in the Results section.

Response 11. We appreciate this comment, but we believe we discuss results from supplementary figure 1 in the line 103-105. Nevertheless, we agree this should be also present in the discussion.

Minor changes:

Comment 1. pCR abbreviation is stated in line 15, you don't need to restate this in line 21, just use the abbreviation.

Response 1. Amended as suggested

Comment 2. Line 47-51: The LAR abbreviation is repeated and the mesenchymal abbreviation is different in line 47 vs. line 51, probably better to just go with MES since you use this in the rest of the manuscript instead of just M.

Response 2. Amended as suggested

Comment 3. Table 1. Legend- You use MES for mesenchymal stem-cell like, you should change this to MSL to stay consistent to line 48 and so it is not confused with just the MES used for mesenchymal alone from line 51. Also you have just M for mesenchymal but use MES throughout the manuscript this needs to be changed to be consistent.

Response 3. Amended as suggested.

Comment 4. Table 3 legend- W- weak, I- intense are given as abbreviations but W and I do not appear anywhere in the table, are these missing?

Response 4. We appreciate your comment and removed this excess although not intended text.

Comment 5. Line 108- what does CI stand for?

Response 5. We appreciate your comment and added the confidence interval before the abbreviation to improve clarity on line 104.

Comment 6. Line 108, 111- the P in PCR needs to be lower case pCR.

Response 6. Amended as suggested.

Comment 7. Line 116- remove e in meDFS, so it is mDFS

Response 7. Amended as suggested.

Comment 8. Line 117- ICH needs to be changed to IHC.

Response 8. Amended as suggested.

Comment 9. Figure 1B & D, Line 126, 131, needs lower case P for pCR.

Response 9. Amended as suggested.

Comment 10. Line 152- add a comma after Oakman and periods after C and al.

Response 10. Amended as suggested.

Comment 11. Line 153- remove the extra "l" for et al.

Response 11. Amended as suggested.

Comment 12. Line 163- remove the parentheses around 15.0% as it is apart of the sentence and not a side note.

Response 12. Amended as suggested.

Comment 13. Line 187- receptor is already apart of the abbreviation for AR so you need to remove "receptor" after AR.

Response 13. Amended as suggested.

We hope the revised version covers the reviewers suggestions and look forward to hear the feedback in due course.